

In paragraph 2 on page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over International Application Number WO 96/18273 (hereinafter Doe) in view of U.S. Patent 6,044,264 issued to Huotari et al (hereinafter Huotari).

The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the following reasons.

Applicant's claim 1 sets forth, among other steps, a method for location updating of a wireless terminal in a communications system comprising a number of private branch exchanges and at least one telephone exchange, the communications system being connected to a public integrated services network and an intelligent network. The method comprises the terminal sending, in connection with a call setup, a location updating message to a private branch exchange and the private branch exchange sending a call setup message to the exchange. The method further comprises the private branch exchange adding the location information (e.g., FIG. 2A-Step 2, FIG. 2B-Step 2) and the identity of the terminal (e.g., TE) to the call setup message. The method further comprises the telephone exchange sending a node (e.g., SCP) of the intelligent network a service request (e.g., FIG. 2A-Step 3, FIG. 2B-Step 3), the service request including the location information and the identity of the terminal, and the node of the intelligent network adding the location information of the terminal to the subscriber number. See page 4 lines 7--34 of the instant application.

In other words, Applicant's invention seeks to make available the subscriber location data by means of an Intelligent Networking technique, where signalling between a telephone exchange, a PBX, and an intelligent network node is supplemented with extra information on the location of the subscriber terminal.

As admitted by the Office Action, Doe fails to disclose that the exchange sends service requests including adding the location information and the identity of the terminal to an intelligent node. In addition, as admitted by the Office Action, Doe fails to teach that the intelligent node adds the location information of the terminal to the subscriber number.

Huotari fails to remedy the deficiencies of Doe because Doe does not teach that the telephone exchange sends a node of the intelligent network a service request, the service request including the location information and the identity of the terminal, which is in contrast to Applicant's claimed invention.

Huotari, on the other hand, teaches that subscriber based trigger keys are transferred between the HLR and the VLR to allocate a supplementary service code for IN services that are offered for the subscriber. (See column 7 lines 25-32). The trigger keys, however, only indicate which IN services have been provisioned for the subscriber terminal and do not by themselves offer information concerning the identity and location information of the subscriber, which is in contrast to Applicant's claimed invention.

Furthermore, Huotari teaches that the trigger keys are merely transferred between nodes of a conventional network, e.g., an HLR and a VLR, whereas Applicant's claimed invention sets forth that subscriber identity and location information is transferred from a telephone exchange to a node of an intelligent network.

Applicant submits, therefore, that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the combination of Doe and Huotari and is in condition for allowance. Claims 8 and 10 set

forth limitations similar to those set forth in claim 1 and are also allowable for at least the same reasons as discussed above for claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-7, 9 and 11-13, which are dependent from independent claims 1, 8 and 10, respectively, are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Doe and Huotari. While Applicant does not acquiesce with any particular rejections to these dependent claims, it is believed that these rejections are now moot in view of the remarks made in connection with independent claims 1, 8 and 10. These dependent claims include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, and recite additional features which further distinguish these claims from the cited references. Therefore, dependent claims 2-7, 9 and 11-13 are also allowable over the combination of Doe and Huotari.

CONCLUSION

In view of the reasons provided above, it is believed that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and early allowance of all pending claims.


If a telephone conference would be helpful in resolving any issues concerning this communication, please contact Applicant's agent of record, Michael T. Wallace, at 952.253.4127.

Respectfully submitted,

Altera Law Group, LLC
6500 City West Parkway, Suite 100
Minneapolis, MN 55344-7704
952.253.4127

Date: August 22, 2002

By:


Michael T. Wallace
Reg. No. 45,420

MTW/mar